

RECEIVED  
JUL - 1 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800  
#Skepsis  
11/10/03

EPIGRAPH: It does not grand matter for me if you will take (re-written from given Refs. [30])  
scie slip (VISIBLE [in famous Abstract too] in several places with visibly done corrections),  
because it is not important for SPECIALIST, who certainly knows by heart this the MOST  
known nuclear reaction of beta-decay... But for men, who very carefully found only two  
examples (wherein even these ones were complete 100% ABSURD!) and claim all best new  
PHYSICS Disclosure as "incomprehensible", it is the penal condemnation of Proven low level  
for such "scientific" critics and consequently their penal apriori wishes. (Because it is without  
certainly known for them their real scientific knowledge FOR THIS).

After my last sending of 10 pages of proven science, their penal wishes could, for instance,  
be in NEW STYLISTICS, in more than potential penalty? Certainly, without doubt annihilated  
by my Science and Technique without any other issue. (By anyway! Apriori!)? Such men must be seized!

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks (personally) Dr.Y.Zagyansky, Entraide, 22 rue Ste  
Mr. James E. Rogan (personally) Marthe 75010 Paris France

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual  
Property and Director of USPTO

Appl. N°09/744,994 (PCT/IB00/00843)  
Conf.N°4671, Art. Unit 2881 (Tech.C.N°2800)

PCT filing date 06/22/00, date of USPTO entry 02/21/01

Paris, 27th May 2003

Dear Director of USPTO,  
§1. This is the time urgently! (with open Totalitarianism) to show the too obvious very recent slips of "the  
most important classical case of the transformation of neutron into proton" (pp.14 and 16 during my  
future quickly prepared promised publication, beginning of which you were justly sent) RE-WRITTEN!!!  
from classical books [Refs.30]. These slips did not change NOTHING in consecutive text and in ANY  
claim, except this reaction: Claim 3(8) ("plus antineutrino"). My phrase: "It means their difference (1.3  
"MeV") (between mass of neutron and proton- YZ) is more than two times than the electron mass (0.511  
"MeV")" p.16 line 23] again confirms too obvious slips.

§2. But occasionally, such unseeing of even too obvious too important for understanding reaction  
CONFIRMS again and again (and with big penal conviction) that USPTO critics as undoubtedly arbitrary  
because they knew their lower level (that is clearly confirmed above). (It is incredible: in  
denying all, they could find only 2 false examples but they did not see one real obvious SLIP, from which  
they could penally exaggerate fantastical arbitrary story with one example! So it confirms: they made too  
superficial intentional (false) phraseology (like any their "n'importe quoi" [everything] will be  
as law for me without any rights as we yet see!, Dear Highest Supervisor).

§3. I use Rules about possibility of correction of obvious slips (in RE-WRITING de facto the primitive  
nuclear reaction from given Refs. [30]). Sorry for purest proofs of criminal character. In God we trust,  
who gives occasional confirmations against those, who are dishonest and do not trust really, Dear High  
Supervisor appointed by US President personally. Sincerely yours Dr.Y.Zagyansky Supplements: 1.  
Declaration about corrections (below). 2. simply corrected pp. 17, 18, 36, 55 and Abstract (only ~ "plus  
antineutrino" from [30]) in 3 copies.

Declaration about corrections.

I, Dr. Yuly Zagyansky, sole inventor of Application N°09/744,994 (PCT/IB00/00843) correct the following  
too obvious slips mistakenly re-written from given Refs. [30], without any consecutive consequences.

A. p.17-7 instead "proton (and positron). And the rest of the mass must belong to the other light  
particles" it must be "proton (positron and  $\bar{\nu}$ ). And the rest of the mass must belong to the other light particles"

B. p.17-20 instead "without the charge, but also without the electron and positron (and gluon). In the"  
it must be "without the charge, but also without the electron, positron,  $\bar{\nu}$  (and gluon). In the"

C. p.18-9 instead of "neutron is  $n \rightarrow p^+ + e^-$  - see above). In reality /29,30/, one ejects the positrons in", it  
must be:

"neutron is:  $n \rightarrow p^+ + e^- + \bar{\nu}$  - see above). In reality /29,30/, one ejects the positrons in"

D. p.36-14 and 15 instead: " $p^+ = n^0 + e^+ + \text{gluon}$ , p- proton and  $e^+$ - positron and it is not the neutron (n)  
( $n = n^0 + e^+ + e^- + \text{gluon}$ ,  $e^-$ - electron) and this particle is the principal component of the", it must be:  
" $p^+ = n^0 + e^+$ ,  $p^+$ - proton and  $e^+$ - positron and it is not the neutron (n) ( $n =$

$n^0 + e^+ + e^- + \bar{\nu} + \text{gluon}$ ,  $e^-$ - electron) and this particle is the principal component of the"

E. p.55-15 and 16 instead: "The classical neutron contains the electron, positron, and gluon and its  
transformation into the proton takes place with the electron elimination (which can be" it must be:

"8). The classical neutron contains the electron, positron,  $\bar{\nu}$  and gluon and its

transformation into the proton takes place with the electron and  $\bar{\nu}$  elimination (which can be"

F. Abstract: line 16 instead: "gluon, neutro ( $n^0$ - new very inert "neutron" star particle). Planets are born  
due to Sun"

it must be: "anti-nu, gluon, neutro ( $n^0$ - new inert "neutron" star particle). Planets are born due to Sun"

all pages ARE signed verso with date 27th July 2003